

REMARKS

This application has been reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed February 25, 2010. Reconsideration of this application in view of the below remarks is respectfully requested. Claims 3 – 6 and 30 – 41 are pending in the application, with Claims 3, 30, 32, 36 and 38 being in independent form. By the present amendment, Claims 3, 30, 32, 36 and 38 are amended. No new subject matter is introduced into the disclosure by way of the present amendment.

I. Rejection of Claims 3 – 6 and 30 – 41 Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 3 – 6 and 30 – 41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly obvious over U.S. Patent No. 6,222,583 issued to Matsumoto et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,014,608 issued to Seo.

The present Office Action alleges that Matsumoto et al. discloses an estimating means for estimating a position of an object in a captured video image from positional information of the object and image capturing information including information for determining an area where an image will be captured; and a recognition means for recognizing whether the object is present or not using a difference between visual feature quantities of a partial video image of the captured video image and the object and a difference between the position of the partial video image and the estimated position. The present Office Action specifically cites FIGS. 1, 4 and 10, and col. 13, lines 32 – 42. Additionally, Applicants note col. 9, line 59 – col. 10, line 9.

Additionally, the present Office Action concedes that Matsumoto et al. does not disclose that the estimating means estimates a position of an object by also using moving speed information of a video input unit providing the captured video image, as recited in Applicants

Claims 3, 30, 32, 36 and 38. Consequently, the present rejection introduces the teachings and suggestion of Seo in an effort to overcome the deficiencies in Matsumoto et al.

However, neither Matsumoto et al. nor Seo, taken alone or in any proper combination, discloses using time information, e.g. time table or diagram, etc., in combination with position information to identify an object that cannot be identified by positional information alone. (See: Applicants' page 19, lines 13 – 22).

Therefore, as amend herein, Claims 3, 30, 32, 36 and 38, reciting: "...image capturing information including time information for determining an area where an image will be captured..." are believed to be allowable over the cited prior art references. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection with respect to Claims 3 – 6 and 30 – 41 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Matsumoto et al. in view of Seo.

CONCLUSIONS

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all claims presently pending in the application, namely, Claims 3 – 6 and 30 – 41 are believed to be in condition for allowance and patentably distinguishable over the art of record.

If the Examiner should have any questions concerning this communication or feels that an interview would be helpful, the Examiner is requested to call Applicant's undersigned attorney at the number indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,



Katherine R. Vieyra
Registration No. 47,155

Scully, Scott, Murphy, & Presser, P.C.
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343
KRV/DAT:dk